

Appl. No.: 10/611,833  
TC/A.U.: 3711 Docket No.: B03-13  
Reply to Office Action of August 25, 2004

### REMARKS

Claims 1-31 and 33-47 appear in this application for the Examiner's review and consideration.

The Examiner has acknowledged that claims 1-31 are allowed, and claims 34-38 and 41-47 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claim 34 has been re-written in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim 33, and claims 39-43, 46, and 47 have been amended to depend from claim 34.

Claim 33 has been amended to recite that the cover layer is about 0.01 inches. Support for the amended element is found at least on page 16, lines 28-29.

Claim 32 has been cancelled without prejudice to Applicants' right to file one or more continuing and/or divisional applications directed to any subject matter not presently claimed.

No new matter has been added by these amendments.

### Rejection Over U.S. Patent No. 5,820,488

Claims 33, 39, and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,820,488 to Sullivan *et al.* ("Sullivan"). Claims 39 and 40 have been amended to depend now from independent claim 34, which is believed to be allowable. As such, the rejection against these claims is now moot.

For claims to be rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), each and every element as set forth in the claims of the present invention must be found, either expressively or inherently, in a single prior art reference. Applicants respectfully submit that Sullivan does not disclose or suggest a cover having a thickness of about 0.01 inches. Sullivan teaches a cover having a thickness of greater than 0.03 inches in claim 1 and a cover having a thickness of 0.04-0.1 in column 5 line 67. Thus, Sullivan does not suggest the Applicant's claim elements.

Accordingly, independent claim 33 is believed to be in condition for allowance for at least the reason set forth above. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

### Double Patenting Rejection Over U.S. Patent No. 6,632,147

Claim 32 was rejected under obviousness-type double patenting over claim 17 of U.S. Patent No. 6,632,147 to Cavallaro *et al.* Claim 32 has been cancelled, rendering the rejection moot.

Page 8 of 9

Appl. No.: 10/611,833  
TC/A.U.: 3711 Docket No.: B03-13  
Reply to Office Action of August 25, 2004

### Conclusion

Based on the remarks set forth above, Applicants believe that all of the rejections have been overcome and the claims of the subject application are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any further concerns or believe that a discussion with the Applicants' attorney would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the attorney at the number below.

No fee is believed to be due for this submission. However, should any required fees be due, please charge them to Acushnet Company Deposit Account No. 502309.

9/15/04  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Respectfully submitted,



\_\_\_\_\_  
Troy R. Lester (Reg. No. 36,200)  
(508) 979-3534

Customer Number: 40990